

**09/207,871**  
**REMARKS**

Claim 3 has been rejected as unpatentable over Robbins in view of Stover; claims 4 and 5 have been rejected as unpatentable further in view of Bodem, Jr.; claims 6-8 have been rejected as unpatentable over Suchanek in view of Kelley and claims 9 and 10 have been rejected as unpatentable further in view of Bodem, Jr. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the attached amended claims and following comments.

With respect to claim 3 the Robbins triple light 16 clearly is mounted at the center of the front of a truck body 12 and the single light 16 clearly is mounted on the truck body side 14 adjacent the front as shown in FIG.1. The triple light, being at the center is not adjacent the side as contended by the examiner. FIG. 4 is merely a section through the single light 16 and FIG. 6 is merely a close-up of the front triple light 16. Neither FIG. 4 nor FIG. 6 show light covers facing rearward as contended by the examiner because none of the lights in Robbins face the rear or are at the rear. Robbins discloses absolutely nothing about lighting at the rear of a truck body.

Applicant has further amended claim 3 by adding in line 5 a limitation to "on the back" to further emphasize that applicant's two light bodies and covers are to be mounted on the back adjacent to the top and adjacent each side of the first vehicle. The limitations in lines 4-6 of claim 3 are nowhere disclosed or suggested in Robbins or Stover in combination therewith and therefore claim 3 is allowable.

Bodem, Jr. makes no further suggestion as to the location of the lights, therefore claims 4 and 5, being dependent on claim 3, should be allowable with claim 3.

With respect to claims 4-6, newly cited Suchanek discloses what appear to be various lights wrapped around the upper left and right rear corners of an extended cab or sleeper cab for a semi-tractor. Suchanek does not disclose any details of the light structure or circuitry. Kelley does disclose circuitry but for an entirely different center mounted car roof lighting. In view of the Suchanek Patent, independent claim 4 has been amended by adding a paragraph phrase between lines 7 and 8 specifying some of the construction of each light with a base and a cover enclosing the light. Thus, as amended claim 4 distinguishes over Suchanek and Kelly.

The remaining claims 7-10 incorporate claim 6 by reference and therefore should be allowable upon the allowance of claim 6.